

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-11 were rejected, and various ones of these are amended above to obviate these rejections.

Claims 12-22 have been allowed.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for his courtesy and efforts in reaching out by telephone to address these issues. If any issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Matthew S. Anderson, Reg. No. 39,093, at 972-628-3670 to resolve these. A new Power of Attorney and Change of Correspondence address to USPTO Customer Number 45113 was filed in this matter on March 29, 2010, and is available in PAIR, but has not yet been acted upon by the Office. Mr. Anderson is an attorney of record on USPTO Customer Number 45113.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. §101:

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended above, and these rejections are believed obviated.

Claim 1 is amended to specify that various steps are performed by a system having at least a hardware processor. Such a system is described on page 8, line 31 – page 10, line 19 of the specification as filed. These paragraphs describe various individual and composite systems for alternate embodiments including a thin client, a rich client, the overall systems interconnecting networks, and included processors that execute the “integrated decision support framework

application". By these amendments to claim 1, claims 1-10 are believed to be clearly directed to statutory subject matter under the recent changes in the relevant law.

The preamble of Claim 11 is re-arranged and amended to likewise conform to the current standards. The preamble phrase "Software for integrated decision support, the software being embodied in a computer-readable medium and when executed operable to" in the claim as filed is amended to read "A computer-readable medium storing software that when executed is operable to cause a processor to perform the steps of". These amendments are substantially supported in Claim 11 as filed as merely a re-arrangement of the original claim language, and are also supported in the passage cited above that describes that processor executing the software. Claim 11 as amended is therefore also believed to be directed to statutory subject matter.

All statutory subject matter rejections are therefore believed obviated and are traversed.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the statutory subject matter rejection.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that this Application be passed to issue.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *michael.wallace@siemens.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

April 12, 2010



Michael Wallace
Reg. No. 44,486
Attorney for Applicants
Tel.: (770) 751-2351

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830